

BVCP Process Subcommittee Meeting
November 29, 2016 – noon-1:00
Park Central Room 401



Subcommittee Purpose

The Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan (BVCP) Process Subcommittee's Role is to monitor and provide input on the public process throughout the BVCP Update process. The BVCP Committee consists of 2 council members (Weaver, Brockett), 2 planning board members (Gerstle, May), a Boulder County Commissioner (Jones), and a County planning commission member (Gargano).

Attendee: Aaron Brockett (phone), John Gerstle, Sam Weaver (phone)

Staff: Lesli Ellis, Jean Gatza, Philip Kleisler, Nicole Wobus

Public: (6 members)

***Comments by subcommittee** are the bullet points that begin with bold text.

This was a special meeting called on short notice to discuss 2 key items:

1. Preparation for the CU South Meeting / Volunteer Facilitation
2. Update on BVCP Future Choices Forums (low attendance at first meeting, adjustments and communication)
3. Public Comment

1. CU South Meeting

The planned purpose of the meeting is to share analysis and info; give CU opportunity to share info; give community members opportunity to discuss and share ideas.

Agenda will have:

- City presentation – brief. Not a lot of time on the technical info.
- CU presentation – with clarifying questions.
- Group discussion – majority of the meeting – chance for people to talk with each other, record issues, what they have heard, seen in tech info, feedback on factors that they would like to see addressed.
- Time for public comments - share individual comments.

Meeting Planning included 2 meetings w CU for planning. Decided to pilot approach of having volunteer facilitators to work toward neutral facilitation. Offered opportunity for community members through PPWG – trained by Heather, provided packet of info. Facilitators would be neutral; there to ensure the 8-10 people at the table have an opportunity to provide their views. SMEs in the room.

Sent e-mail out to PPWG applicants and asked for people who could remain neutral and objective. First come first serve. Have identified 3 people on the list with a lot of background on issues around the site. Have heard concerns about ability to remain objective.

Purpose of today's discussion is to confirm the process for facilitator selection with the process subcommittee to ensure a good level of comfort moving forward with this approach.

Staff recommends moving forward to have neutral facilitators help with the meeting. Have 14 signed up – ask 3 of those to participate and not facilitate.

Impressions from Committee members:

- **The time at discussion groups may not be completely satisfying. People want to know what is being discussed at other tables. The people who show up at these meetings aren't neutral and are coming because they have opinions. Seems inappropriate to exclude some. At the same time, need to have a practical and useful meeting. It will be worthwhile to have the meeting. Question value of splitting up into working groups. Most desirable way to move forward – not split up, do q and a and everyone gets to hear that. facilitated by Heather.**
- **Agreement with point on neutrality. Concept is unlikely to happen. Excluding some seems arbitrary and subjective. If people agree to facilitate they need to agree to abide by strict ground rules or not take the role.**
- **Not comfortable excluding facilitators, except if with self-reported bias. If people self-report that they cannot, would raise the flag. If willing – take them at their word and see how the experiment works. Like to try it. Important that neutrality is what we shoot for.**
- **Open to the idea of dividing the time. There are people who won't ask a question in a full group setting that would in a small group. Don't want to completely eliminate small group.**
- **City has role in comp plan process – role of setting up the meeting. CU shouldn't be vetoing facilitators. Needs to be the city's process.**
- **There is value to the table conversations – maybe more group time and less table time but useful to have both.**

Summary

- **Mix of table / open comment**
- **Ok with first come first serve facilitators – with ground rules. Try volunteer facilitator approach. No one excluded.**
- **It will be good to learn from this and bring the results back to PPWG.**
- **May need staff to round out facilitators – aim for not planners.**
- **Preference on sequencing – Like plenary session but add time for questions; clarifying questions.**

1. BVCP Forums

Staff described low turnout at first session, series of communication tactics to get the word out.

- **For discussion groups –these are dependent on the number who show up. They aren't very productive if low numbers. Emphasize that people can make comments there, or come to PB and CC meetings and make comments directly to them. Also emphasize e-mail communication. Respond most when see an ad in camera.**
- **Suggestions for additional targeted outreach: newsletters and mailing lists; add recreation groups, conservation groups. Direct notification. Like the next door outreach.**

Public comment

1. Donna George – made statement process broken. Land use changes – one pushed aside and the other moved forward. What is going to happen with CU – process needs to be looked at.
2. Michael – bvcp meetings – find areas of agreement. Good yet detailed info. Trying to get info out beforehand. Very little value to people. If you want to get to agreement – move to narrowly focused questions. Take some risks and put out more specific questions. Need questions on issues. Concerned – jobs:housing – not sure 20 minutes is enough. Messaging important.
3. Sally E – CU – taking comment at the end of the meeting – hard to feel engaged. Talked to 40 people. Don't feel heard. No one knows what this stuff means. Not very concrete - don't know what that means... "arts, parking, housing". NB as a viable community, arts focus. Don't feel issues are addressed.
4. Amy – need to add info to next door – for meetings. NB art district in Feb. don't see any arts stuff in communications. Need to do a better job of reaching out to the community. Concerned for people who just want to know and to provide feedback – need a venue.
5. Lynn – huge fracture – needs hard discussion. Disagreement that is out there. Not whitewashing everything. Since impact fees. Housing biggest issues. Need creative issues. Not sustainable. Ok that people differ. Do bigger groups until you can break down creative ideas. Jobs housing is everything. Too short.
6. Ben – don't want cu telling city who can attend. 2 hour meeting not sufficient. Members of the public should be part of working group w staff and cu. Invited. At the meeting – clarifying questions – after city and CU. Public should have opportunity to speak before small groups. Transportation study – lacking in detail. Need basics – traffic counts. There are issues. Need constraints on the site.